

## **REMARKS**

The Office Action dated June 25, 2009, has been received and reviewed. This response, submitted along with a Petition for a Three-Month Extension of Time, is directed to that action.

Claims 1, 4 9 and 10 have been amended, and claim 2 has been cancelled. Support for the amendments to claim 1 can be found in claim 2 as originally filed, and in paragraphs [0011] and [0012] of the published US application, 2007/0027053 A1. No new matter has been added.

The applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

### **Claim Rejections- 35 U.S.C. §102**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Domburg et al. (US 5,747,441). The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

To anticipate a claim, the reference must disclose each and every element of the claimed invention. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of Cal.*, 814 F.2d 628, 2 USPQ 2d 1051 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The applicants respectfully submit that Domburg fails to teach each and every element of the presently claimed invention.

The presently claimed invention, as amended, is now directed to a liquid detergent composition wherein the enzyme and bleach are *both* coated, and the bleach coating is the substrate for the enzyme. Domburg only teaches a coated bleach particle comprising an enzyme, and there is nothing to even suggest that the enzyme in Domburg's composition would be coated separately from the bleach and that the bleach coating could act as the

enzyme substrate. Accordingly, Domburg does not teach each and every limitation of the presently claimed invention, and therefore the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

The Examiner rejected claim 1-3, 6 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by GB 1,242,247. The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As with Domburg, GB'247 also fails to teach that a composition wherein both bleach and enzyme are coated, and the bleach coating acts as the enzyme substrate. Therefore, because GB '247 fails to teach all of the limitations of the presently claimed invention, the reference does not anticipate the claims and the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

#### Claim Rejections- 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner rejected claims 5, 7, 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over GB 1,242,247 in view of Domburg. The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

A *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be established because the differences between the presently claimed invention and the cited references are outside the level of ordinary skill in the art.

The combination of features of the presently claimed invention leads to a composition that sequentially releases bleach and enzyme during use in a washing context such that release of the bleach component into the wash liquor cannot occur unless induced by enzyme activity, wherein the enzyme itself has to be firstly freed to operate. Thus, advantageously the enzymes are allowed to perform their function in addressing

stains on the materials being cleaned before there is any possibility that the enzymes could be detrimentally damaged by exposure to bleach in the washing liquor. This is due to the novel and unobvious construction of the presently claimed composition, which was not taught or suggested in the prior art.

The GB '247 references teaches an embodiment where the coating system is entirely controlled by temperature—the coating for the bleach is designed to dissolve at relatively high temperatures ( $> 50^{\circ}\text{C}$ ), and the coating for the enzyme is intended to dissolve at relatively low temperatures ( $< 50^{\circ}\text{C}$ ). (See page 1, lines 1-47). Therefore, GB '247 does attempt to provide a detergent system wherein the enzyme is released before the bleach. Therefore, there would be no reason why a person of ordinary skill in the art would have modified GB '247 as suggested in order to arrive at the present invention.

Moreover, Domburg is directed to a solid granular composition whereas the presently claimed invention is directed to a liquid composition. A person of ordinary skill in the art would not look to the teachings of solid compositions for reference when making liquid compositions.

Based on the foregoing remarks, the applicants respectfully submit that a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be established, and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

Applicants believe that the claims are in condition for allowance, and such favorable action is respectfully requested. If any issues remain, the resolution of which may be advanced through a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicants' attorney at the phone number listed below.

**CONDITIONAL PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME**

If any extension of time for this response is required, Applicants request that this be considered a petition therefore. Please charge the required fee to Deposit Account No. 14-1263.

**ADDITIONAL FEES**

Please charge any further insufficiency of fees, or credit any excess to Deposit Account No. 14-1263

Respectfully submitted,

NORRIS McLAUGHLIN & MARCUS, P.A.

By /Mark D. Marin/

Mark D. Marin - Reg. No. 50,842  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
875 Third Avenue - 8<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, New York 10022  
Phone: (212) 808-0700